

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/759,394	01/16/2004	Daniel R. Foster	13213-061001	6690
26191	7590 04/04/2006		EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C. PO BOX 1022			HOGE, GARY CHAPMAN	
	LIS, MN 55440-1022		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	• ,	·	3611	

DATE MAILED: 04/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	-
	10/759,394	FOSTER, DANIEL R.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
•	Gary C. Hoge	3611	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING ID  Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period.  Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC .136(a). In no event, however, may a red d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON te, cause the application to become AB	CATION.  Exply be timely filed  THS from the mailing date of this communication.  ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11.	January 2006		
	is action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allows		ers, prosecution as to the merits is	
closed in accordance with the practice under	•	• •	
Disposition of Claims			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-9,12,13 and 17-28</u> is/are pending	in the application.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra			
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6) Claim(s) <u>1-9,12,13,18-24 and 26-28</u> is/are rej	ected.		
7)⊠ Claim(s) <u>17 and 25</u> is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	or election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examin	ner		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac		ov the Examiner	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	•	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	• •	
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E		• •	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig	n priority under 35 LLS C &	119(a) (d) or (f)	
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	ii pilotity ulidel 33 0.3.0. g	119(a)-(d) of (i).	
1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documer	ate have been received		
2. Certified copies of the priority documer		nnlication No	
3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri			
application from the International Burea	•	received in this National Stage	
* See the attached detailed Office action for a lis		received	
220 the attacked actained control action for a no	. c. are common copies flot		
Address and a			
Attachment(s)  1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	· A\ \ Interview 0	ummanı (PTO 413)	
Notice of References Cited (P10-892)		ummary (PTO-413) )/Mail Date	
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date		formal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 1-6, 8, 9, 12, 18-24, 26 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Struhl (5,275,438).

Struhl discloses a card comprising a front panel 4 and a rear panel 6 connected at a fold line, the front panel having a front surface, a plurality of peripheral edges, and an interior surface, and a collapsible bag structure 18 attached to the front surface such that the collapsible bag structure is positioned forward of the front panel, the collapsible bag structure having outer edges spaced apart from the peripheral edges of the front panel so that a substantial portion of the front surface of the front panel is viewable (col. 3, lines 36-37), the collapsible bag structure having at least one fold line (col. 3, lines 52-56) such that at least a portion of the structure (i.e., the flap 42) is adjustable to a collapsed condition, wherein the collapsible bag structure is operable to releasably retain an object (the recitation that the object is a gift card is a statement of intended use), and wherein the peripheral edges of the front panel include a top edge 12a and a left edge 14b, the collapsible bag structure has an opening 44 that faces toward the top edge of the front panel, and the fold line at which the front panel and rear panel are connected is disposed proximal to the left edge of the front panel. See Fig. 1.

Application/Control Number: 10/759,394 Page 3

Art Unit: 3611

Regarding claims 1 and 9, a "bag" is defined as "a container of flexible material, such as paper, plastic, or leather, that is used for storing items."

Regarding claims 2, 3 and 20, a larger bag of the type disclosed by Struhl could be used as a shopping bag.

Regarding claims 4 and 22, Struhl discloses a retention element 52.

Regarding claim 12, an "envelope" is defined as "something that envelops; a wrapping."

The retaining means disclosed by Struhl meets that definition.

Regarding claim 18, the claim is a subcombination claim drawn to a card and a container.

Limitations drawn to the object to be placed in the container are merely statements of intended use and do not patentably distinguish the claim over the prior art.

Regarding claim 21, the bag structure disclosed by Struhl is capable of retaining a prepaid gift card. The recitation that the bag "resembles a shopping bag from a retail store" is merely an ornamental consideration, and it has been held that matters relating to ornamentation only, and having no mechanical function, cannot be relied on where claims are not directed to design but are structural claims. *In re Seid*, 73 USPQ 431.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 1-9, 12, 18-24, 26 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guderyon (5,288,144) in view of Struhl (5,275,438).

Art Unit: 3611

Guderyon discloses a card comprising a front panel 14 and a rear panel 16 connected at a fold line 24, the front panel having a front surface, a plurality of peripheral edges, and an interior surface, and a collapsible bag structure 8 attached to the front surface such that the collapsible bag structure is positioned forward of the front panel, the collapsible bag structure having outer edges spaced apart from the peripheral edges of the front panel so that a substantial portion of the front surface of the front panel is viewable, the collapsible bag structure having at least one fold line 20 such that at least a portion of the structure (i.e., the flap 28) is adjustable to a collapsed condition, wherein the collapsible bag structure is operable to releasably retain an object (the recitation that the object is a gift card is a statement of intended use), and wherein the peripheral edges of the front panel include a top edge and a left edge, the collapsible bag structure has an opening, and the fold line at which the front panel and rear panel are connected is disposed proximal to the left edge of the front panel. See Fig. 2. However, the opening of the collapsible bag structure faces toward the side edge of the front panel. Struhl teaches that it was known in the art to attach a bag structure with its opening facing toward the top edge of the front panel. Compare Figs. 4 and 6. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to orient the collapsible bag structure toward the top edge of the front panel, as taught by Struhl, in order to store the card in the upright position shown in Fig. 6 of Struhl, as is commonly done.

Regarding claims 1 and 9, a "bag" is defined as "a container of flexible material, such as paper, plastic, or leather, that is used for storing items."

Regarding claims 2, 3 and 20, a larger bag of the type disclosed by Guderyon could be used as a shopping bag.

Regarding claims 4 and 22, Guderyon discloses a retention element 30.

Regarding claim 12, an "envelope" is defined as "something that envelops; a wrapping."

The retaining means disclosed by Guderyon meets that definition.

Regarding claim 18, the claim is a subcombination claim drawn to a card and a container.

Limitations drawn to the object to be placed in the container are merely statements of intended use and do not patentably distinguish the claim over the prior art.

Regarding claim 21, the bag structure disclosed by Guderyon is capable of retaining a prepaid gift card. The recitation that the bag "resembles a shopping bag from a retail store" is merely an ornamental consideration, and it has been held that matters relating to ornamentation only, and having no mechanical function, cannot be relied on where claims are not directed to design but are structural claims. *In re Seid*, 73 USPQ 431.

5. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guderyon (5,288,144) in view of Struhl (5,275,438) as applied to claim 26 above, and further in view of MacWilliams et al. (2002/0050711).

Guderyon discloses the invention substantially as claimed, as set forth above. However, there is no text on the front of the card. MacWilliams teaches that it was known in the art to put text on the front cover of a folder. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to put text on the front cover of the folder disclosed by Guderyon, in order to convey information about the contents of the folder.

6. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Struhl (5,275,438) in view of Walton (6,652,178).

Application/Control Number: 10/759,394 Page 6

Art Unit: 3611

Struhl discloses the invention substantially as claimed, as set forth above, including a container attached to a folder sheet. However, the container is not in the form of a collapsible box. Walton teaches that it was known in the art to provide a folder sheet with a collapsible box for storing cards. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the folder sheet disclosed by Struhl with a collapsible box, as taught by Walton, in order to store cards.

7. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guderyon (5,288,144) in view of Struhl (5,275,438) as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Walton (6,652,178).

Guderyon discloses the invention substantially as claimed, as set forth above, including a container attached to a folder sheet. However, the container is not in the form of a collapsible box. Walton teaches that it was known in the art to provide a folder sheet with a collapsible box for storing cards. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the folder sheet disclosed by Guderyon with a collapsible box, as taught by Walton, in order to store cards.

## Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 17 and 25 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

## Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Application/Control Number: 10/759,394 Page 7

Art Unit: 3611

#### Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gary C. Hoge whose telephone number is (571) 272-6645. The examiner can normally be reached on 5-4-9.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lesley Morris can be reached on (571) 272-6651. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217/9197 (toll-free).

Gary C'Hoge Primary Examiner Art Unit 3611

gch